

SECTION M

EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.1 BASIS OF AWARD (NEGOTIATED).

The Government intends to make a single or multiple award to the responsible Offeror(s) as evaluated in accordance with the evaluation factors set forth in this section, Section M. The Government intends to make award(s) to the Offeror(s) whose proposal(s) represent(s) the best overall value to the Government, considering both price and non-price evaluation factors. The Government will consider the completeness, reasonableness, and realism of the proposed price. The proposal(s) will also be compared to the Government Estimate for continued Government ownership. The Government Estimate will assume adequate Government funding and personnel resources and operation of the utility systems in a prudent business manner. The Government will perform a 15- year and 25-year life cycle cost estimate for each proposal and Government Estimate. If all received proposals result in greater costs to the Government over the life cycle periods, then the Government reserves the right not to award a contract.

M.1.1 Proposal Evaluation.

All proposals will be evaluated by a team of Government personnel, to determine the extent to which each Offeror demonstrates a clear understanding of the RFP requirements. The Offeror shall submit a proposal that completely addresses all evaluation areas specifically identifying how each proposed contractual requirement will be satisfied. Proposals which are unrealistic in terms of management, quality, technical approach or have unrealistic prices will be deemed reflective of an inherent lack of technical competence or indicative of failure to comprehend the complexity and risks of the proposed contractual requirements. The evaluation team will rate each proposal strictly in accordance with its content and will not presume that performance will include areas not specified in the Offeror's written proposal.

M.1.2 Competitive Range.

A competitive range will be established. The competitive range will be based solely on the factors contained in the solicitation. The Competitive range will include all of the most highly rated proposals. Those Offerors whose proposals are not within the competitive range will be notified in writing, and any revision of their proposals will not be considered. Offerors excluded from the competitive range may request a debriefing.

M.1.3 Discussions.

Discussions will be conducted with all Offerors in the competitive range in accordance with FAR 15.306. The Government will discuss all significant weakness, deficiencies and all other aspects of an Offerors proposal that could be altered or explained to enhance materially the Offerors chance of award.

M.1.4 Evaluation of Proposal Revisions.

The proposal revisions including final proposal revisions will be evaluated against the same criteria as the initial Offerors.

M.1.5 Evaluation Ratings.

The Government will make an evaluation of all Offerors, documenting advantages and disadvantages and will assign an adjective rating for each evaluation factor. Each adjectival rating may be broken into adjectival sub-ratings utilizing the High, Medium, or Low designations. The adjectival ratings assigned by the evaluators shall be as follows:

- (1) Excellent
- (2) Good
- (3) Satisfactory
- (4) Poor
- (5) Unacceptable

M.2 EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD.

M.2.1 Evaluation Factors.

In selecting the Offeror most advantageous to the Government, the following factors will be considered.

M.2.1.1 Technical Factors.

- (A) Technical Capability (L.10.2.1)
 - (1) Initial Capital Improvement Plan, Technical.
 - (2) Performance Compliance Plan.
 - (3) Initial O&M Plan.
- (B) Management Approach (L.10.2.2)
 - (1) Organizational Procedures.
 - (2) Operational Structure.
 - (3) Subcontracting Management.
 - (4) Management Qualifications.

(5) Oral Presentation.

(C) Financial Capability (L.10.2.3)

(D) Past Performance (L.10.2.4)

M.2.1.2 Price Factor (L.10.3)

M.2.1.3 Subcontracting Plan Factor (L.10.4)

M.2.2 Technical Factor and Subfactor(s).

The technical factors are listed in descending order of importance. The subfactors contained within each factor are also listed in descending or equal order of importance.

Technical factors A through D (§ M.2.1.1) shall be evaluated for compliance with requirements of this RFP, for technical accuracy, feasibility and reasonableness. In addition to these factors, proposals will be evaluated based upon advantages and disadvantages to the Government that might result from awarding more than one contract. The above price factor shall be evaluated for compliance with requirements of this RFP, and for cost realism, reasonableness, and feasibility. The above subcontracting plan factor will be evaluated for compliance with requirements of this RFP.

M.2.2.1 Technical Capability. The Offeror's overall approach, combined with its presentation of technical experience and capability will be evaluated for suitability in relation to the Government's needs as described in accordance with the requirements of Paragraph L.10.2.1, Technical Approach for the Initial Capital Improvement Plan, Technical (ICIP), Performance Compliance Plan, and Initial O&M Plan. The Government will evaluate the demonstrated/communicated knowledge, experience, and prudence of approaches contained within these plans. These plans will be evaluated for proposed initial and long-term upgrades/renewals/replacements, compliance to standards/regulations/rules/guidance, and proposed operation and maintenance procedures. The Government will evaluate more favorably an ICIP that demonstrates completion of capital improvement projects prior to the required timelines described in Paragraph C.5.1.1.

M.2.2.2 Management Approach. Offerors will be evaluated on the proposed management approach in accordance with Paragraph L.10.2.2, Management Approach. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's demonstrated expertise in managing projects, including multiple UDC Systems and subcontractors if applicable, dependent upon the CLIN proposed.

M.2.2.3 Financial Capability. The Offeror's demonstrated capability to provide capital funding in accordance with the requirements of Paragraph L.10.2.3, Financial Capability will be evaluated. A minimum level of 50% of the Offeror-estimated "replacement cost new"

(RCN) of each UDC System proposed is required for an acceptable evaluation. Demonstration of higher financing levels may result in more favorable Government evaluations.

M.2.2.4 *Past Performance*. Offerors will be evaluated on performance under existing and prior contracts/subcontracts for services similar in scope, magnitude, and complexity to this requirement. The Government will focus on information that demonstrates quality of performance relative to the size and complexity of the CLIN proposed. The Offeror's past performance, including all partners and 1st tier subcontractors will be evaluated for the timeliness of performance, cost control, safety, customer satisfaction, and the comprehensive nature of previous projects. Assessment of the Offeror's past performance will be one means of evaluating the credibility of the Offeror's proposal, and relative capability to meet the performance requirements. Information utilized will be obtained from the Past Performance Questionnaires (Section J, List of Attachments) returned to the Government from the Offeror's customers. The Government reserves the right to request and/or seek additional past performance information.

M.2.3 Price Factor.

The Government will evaluate all aspects of the cost/price proposal for ease and accuracy of application, fairness, reasonableness, content of detail, and accuracy of completion. The proposals/worksheets will be analyzed individually and collectively and compared to a Government developed cost estimate. The Government developed cost estimate cannot be provided to any Offeror. The price factor shall not be point scored, but will be a consideration in the award selection. All evaluation factors other than cost or price, when combined, are approximately equal to cost or price. An award may be made to the responsible Offeror whose proposal offers the best value to the Government and provides a positive saving over the scenario of continued Government ownership. The Government will perform a cost realism analysis on all proposals to determine if the proposed cost figures truly and accurately represent the technical approach described in the Offeror's proposal.

M.2.4 Subcontracting Plan Factor

The subcontracting plans will be separately evaluated as either acceptable or not acceptable. Failure to submit and negotiate an acceptable subcontracting plan shall make an Offeror ineligible for award of the contract.

M.3 ORAL PRESENTATIONS.

M.3.1 Oral Presentations.

Only Offerors that are determined to be in the competitive range will be invited to give Oral Presentations. Oral Presentations will be scheduled by drawing lots after determination of the competitive range. Offerors will be notified of the date and time for their oral presentation no sooner than five (5) working days following receipt of offers. Requests to reschedule an

Offeror's oral presentation will be at the sole discretion of the Source Selection Authority. Each Oral Presentation session will be videotaped and a copy will be made available to the Offeror.

M.3.1.1 Oral Presentation Purpose. The purpose of the oral presentation is to permit Offerors to explain and clarify their written technical proposals. The proceedings will be formal and structured, consisting of a timed presentation by the Offeror followed by a question and answer session.

M.3.1.2 Oral Presentation Attendees. A maximum of six Offeror personnel will be permitted to participate. Attendees must include the proposed Project Manager and the Utility Maintenance Manager and may include representatives of major subcontractors, team members, or joint venturers.

M.3.1.3 Oral Presentation Guidance. The Offeror's total presentation time will be limited to 90 minutes. The use of written media or other media, except for charts, to supplement the presentation will not be permitted. At the conclusion of the Offeror's presentation, the Government will pose a series of prepared questions designed to elicit a thorough understanding of the Offeror's approach and ability to successfully execute the contract.

M.3.1.4 Oral Presentation Evaluation. Each oral presentation will be rated as a subfactor of the Management Factor.

M.4 EVALUATION PROCEDURES FOR AWARD.

M.4.1 Best Value Award.

The best value continuum (FAR 15.101) will be the used in the source selection process. Technical and Management capabilities play a significant role in the source selection process. The tradeoff process will be used because it may be in the Government's best interests to award to other than to the lowest priced offeror or to other than the highest technically rated offeror.

M.4.2 Award Evaluation.

It is the Government's intention to divest of all subject UDC Systems if economically feasible. An economic analysis will be performed to evaluate the most favorable combination(s) of proposals offered. An award will not be made, if upon completion of an economic analysis, the economic analysis determines that the long-term cost associated with the transfer of ownership exceeds the cost of the Governments continued ownership. Both technical and cost requirements will be considered when evaluating the offers compared to the continued Government ownership. The Government intends to award one or more contracts covering all Installations and all UDC systems. The Government reserves the right to make multiple awards if, after considering the additional administrative costs, it is in the Government's best interest to do so. The Government will select for award the combination of proposals for the five Installations that it determines will provide the best value to the Government. Only one award will be made per Installation. In other

words, a proposal for any one installation must include all the utilities within the installation. In addition, the government reserves the right to award less than all installations for a multiple installation proposal. In other words, a proposal for four of the five installations may be awarded only three installations or less. **ALL OR NONE PROPOSALS ARE NOT PERMITTED.**

END OF SECTION M